

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of MICHAEL BIGGIN, JR.,  
DESTINY HALE, and MADISON BIGGIN,  
Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a  
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KELLIE HALE,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

In the Matter of MICHAEL BIGGIN, JR. and  
MADISON BIGGIN, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a  
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MICHAEL BIGGIN, SR.,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
October 25, 2005

No. 262495  
Ingham Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 00-037721-NA

No. 262712  
Ingham Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 00-037721-NA

Before: Gage, P.J., and Hoekstra and Murray, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from the trial court's orders terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm. These appeals are being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent Kellie Hale is the mother of five children, three of whom are involved in this case. Respondent Michael Biggin, Sr. is the father of two of these three children. The record shows that both respondents were very young when their children were born. Because of respondents' age and immaturity, neither was able to provide proper care, custody, and support for their children. Each of respondent-mother's children was eventually adjudicated. Respondent-mother, with whom the children were initially placed, depended on the services of the court and assistance of adults for the care and custody of her children. Both respondents were ordered to comply with service plans. Although respondent-mother completed the service plan, she did not substantially benefit from the provision of the services and continued to maintain a relationship with respondent-father, even though they were both subject to no-contact orders. The record further shows that respondent-father had anger management and substance abuse issues, and did not fully comply with the service plan.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). With regard to respondent-mother, the principal conditions that led to adjudication were her inability to provide care, custody, and support and her abusive relationship with respondent-father. Respondent-father also failed to provide support for his children and had problems managing his anger. The evidence established that respondent-mother did not benefit from the treatment programs, was unable to provide custody, care, and support for her children, and was unable or refused to comply with orders directing her to have no contact with respondent-father. The evidence further established that respondent-father did not comply with the service plan regarding substance abuse and anger management, did not visit his children under the required supervised conditions, and did not provide support for them.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of either respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although there was some evidence that the children and respondent-mother bonded, other evidence demonstrated that whatever bond existed between them was not beneficial to the children's well-being. Moreover, there is no evidence that respondent-father established a beneficial bond with his children. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Hilda R. Gage  
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray